

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Attachment(s): New Sheet including new Fig. 4A.

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Non-Final Office Action dated August 23, 2005. Claims 1-43 were examined.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) for not showing features recited in claims 12 and 13. Figure 4A is added to illustrate an embodiment of DAC 409 described at least beginning at page 10, line 11. No new matter is added.

Specification

The specification is amended to correct typographical errors and to include reference to Figure 4A.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-43 are objected to for including informalities.

Regarding claim 1, the Office Action states that "a loss-of-signal" in line 6 should be "the loss-of-signal" for clarity since the same phrase is recited in the preamble of the claim. Applicants respectfully maintain that the language of claim 1 is clear. The preamble recites "a loss-of-signal (LOS) condition," (emphasis added) which is distinguishable from "a loss-of-signal indication" (emphasis added) recited by line 6.

Claim 4 is amended to provide antecedent basis. Claim 5 is amended consistent with the amendment to claim 4.

Regarding claim 8, the Office Action states that in "line 2, 'is asserted' should be 'is generated'". Applicants respectfully maintain that the language of claim 8 is clear. Applicants respectfully refer the Examiner to at least the paragraph beginning at page 16, line 3 of the specification in support of this position.

Claim 11 is amended to correct a typographical error.

Claim 12 is amended to correct typographical errors and provide antecedent basis.

Regarding claim 15, the Office Action states that in “line 2, ‘the decimated output’ should be ‘a decimated output’”. Applicants respectfully maintain that the language of claim 15 is clear. In particular, the phrase in lines 1 and 2 of claim 15 stating “decimating an output of the register” provides antecedent basis for “the decimated output” in line 2 of claim 15.

Claim 17 is amended to provide antecedent basis.

Claims 19, 20, 21, 28, and 42 are amended to provide antecedent basis.

Claim 22 is amended to correct a typographical error and provide antecedent basis.

Claims 25 and 26 are amended to correct typographical errors.

Claim 28 is amended to correct typographical errors and provide antecedent basis.

Regarding claim 29, the Office Action states that in “lines 4-5 and 7-8, ‘threshold signal strength level’ should be ‘signal strength threshold level’ in [sic] consistent with other claims; and [sic] line 6, ‘a LOS’ should be ‘the LOS’”. Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 29 is an independent claim and is not required to use language consistent with other claims. In addition, the preamble recites “existence of a loss-of-signal (LOS) condition” (emphasis added) which is distinguishable from “a (LOS) indication” (emphasis added) recited by line 6.

Claim 30 is amended to provide antecedent basis.

Claims 33, 34, and 35 are amended to provide antecedent basis.

Claim 36 is amended to correct a typographical error.

Claim 38 is amended to correct a typographical error. In addition, the Office Action states that “[i]n claim 38, lines 3 and 4, the word ‘circuit’ should be deleted since the transition-to-one converter does not use the word ‘circuit’”. Applicants respectfully maintain that the language of claim 38 is clear.

Claim 42 is amended to provide antecedent basis.

Regarding claim 43, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 43 is an independent claim and is not required to use language consistent with other claims. In addition, the preamble recites “a loss-of-signal (LOS) condition” (emphasis added) which is distinguishable from “a (LOS) indication” (emphasis added) recited by line 5.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to claims 1-43 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2, 4-8, 12-13, 23, 25-26, 28 and 30-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 2 is amended to provide antecedent basis.

Claim 4 is amended to provide antecedent basis.

Claim 12 is amended to clarify the invention.

Claim 13 is amended to provide antecedent basis.

Claim 23 is amended to provide antecedent basis.

Claims 25 and 26 are amended to provide antecedent basis.

Claim 28 is amended to provide antecedent basis.

Claim 36 is amended to provide antecedent basis.

Claim 39 is amended to provide antecedent basis.

Regarding claim 30, the Office Action states that “[t]he preamble of claim 30 recites an integrated circuit for generating a loss-of signal indication, however, the body of the claim fails to recite the performance of the generation of the loss-to-signal indication.” Although Applicants believe that amended claim 30 satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Applicants have addressed the concerns of the Office Action. In addition, the Office

Action states that “it is unclear what is the output of the sample circuit since the sample circuit samples the input data and stores a first value and a second value.” Applicants respectfully maintain that amended claim 30 is clear. Applicants refer the Examiner to at least high speed register 115 and decimator block 121 of Figure 1 and Figure 3.

Claims 31, 33, and 34 are amended consistent with amendments to claim 30.

Claim 42 is amended to provide antecedent basis.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 2, 4-8, 12-13, 23, 25-26, 28 and 30-42 be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1, 3, 9-11, 14-24, 27, 29 and 43 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 2, 4-8, 12-13, 25-26, 28 and 30-42 are indicated as being allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 1-43. Although Applicants believe that the claims are allowable over the art of record, the Examiner's reasons for indication of allowable subject matter do not coincide with the allowed claims. Applicants do not acquiesce in additional limitations included in the Examiner's statement of indication of allowable subject matter.

Applicants believe claims 1-43 are in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance to that effect is respectfully solicited. Nonetheless, if any issues remain that could be more efficiently handled by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the number listed below.



PATENT

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being

- ☐ deposited with the US Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail and addressed as shown above.
☐ facsimile transmitted to the US Patent and Trademark Office.

Date

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL: EV 735338929 US

Respectfully submitted,

Nicole Teitler Cave

Nicole Teitler Cave, Reg. No. 54,021
Attorney for Applicant(s)
(512) 338-6315 (direct)
(512) 338-6300 (main)
(512) 338-6301 (fax)